

County of Roanoke



FY2006-2007
Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Review Committee

Evaluation and Recommendations
February 2006

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Table of Contents

I.	Committee Appointments	1
II.	Executive Summary	2
III.	Capital Project Recommendations	
	Capital Project Prioritization	4
	Project Score Summary – By Category	6
	Recommendations.....	8
IV.	Appendix	
	Committee Goal & Objectives	A1
	Project Evaluation Criteria	A2
	Evaluation Scoring Factors	A3
	Project Specific Comments	A4

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Committee Appointments

In developing the FY2007-2011 Roanoke County CIP, the Board of Supervisors approved a CIP Review Committee comprised of Board-appointed representatives for each magisterial district and members of County-appointed commissions and boards. This unique approach allows a diverse perspective in reviewing and prioritizing capital needs that exist throughout the county. The FY2006-2007 CIP Review Committee is comprised of the following appointed members:

<u>Appointment:</u>	<u>Representing:</u>
Mr. King Harvey	Catawba Magisterial District
Mr. James Anderson	Cave Spring Magisterial District
Mr. Jason Perdue	Hollins Magisterial District
Ms. Erica Kuelz	Vinton Magisterial District
Mr. Brian Garber	Windsor Hills Magisterial District
Mr. Linwood Windley	Industrial Development Authority
Ms. Lisa Boggess	Library Board
Mr. Gary Jarrell	Planning Commission
Mr. Todd Selkirk	Public Safety
Mr. Roger Falls	Parks and Recreation Commission

Facilitated by Roanoke County Staff:

Mr. W. Brent Robertson	Director, Management and Budget
Mr. Chad Sweeney	Budget Manager
Ms. Cathy Tomlin	Budget Analyst

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Executive Summary

February, 2006

Background

A Capital Improvements Program (CIP) is a multiyear management and fiscal planning tool to assist in identifying, prioritizing, financing and constructing public improvements. As most governments realize, the list of potential capital projects far exceeds available funding. Proposed capital projects support different community goals and often benefit particular constituent groups; therefore, a methodology is needed that attempts to balance diverse and sometimes competing community values and needs.

On an annual basis, the Board of Supervisors selects a committee of citizens to evaluate and prioritize submitted capital projects and make recommendations for Board consideration in the capital planning process. The Committee agrees upon guiding principles, goals, and objectives (listed in Appendix); then interviews departmental staff and conducts site visits to understand specific projects.

Results of Evaluation

During development of last year's CIP (FY2006-2010) the Board of Supervisors adopted a listing of "approved" projects that were scheduled over the 5 year planning period and tentative funding was identified for each project. This year's Committee (FY2006-2007) reviewed these projects as part of their evaluation process and recommends these approved projects remain at the highest priority for implementation over the next 5 year planning period. These approved projects are reported as Previously Approved Projects on the Capital Project Prioritization summary (page 4).

The Committee prioritized all other capital project requests by applying a set of evaluation criteria to each individual project. The Committee used 12 separate criterion to score projects using values important to the community that were derived from previously adopted plans, policies (i.e. Community Plan), and statements articulated by the Board of Supervisors. After scoring was completed by committee members, each project's average score was calculated and listed in numerical order with the highest score representing the greatest priority. The Level 1 projects represent capital needs that have the highest perceived community value, but have no identified funding associated with them. The Committee has identified Level 1 capital projects as follows:

- Roanoke County/Salem Jail Renovations
- Mt. Pleasant Library Relocation
- Glenvar Library Expansion
- Brambleton Recreation Center Renovations
- Regional Storm Water Management & Flood Control
- Parks & Recreation Land Bank

The complete listing of prioritized projects follows the Executive Summary.

Committee Recommendations

While charged with developing a citizen-based prioritization of existing capital needs, the Committee also discussed and reached consensus on a number of capital programming recommendations for the Board to consider:

- **Long Range Capital Planning.**
 - *Comprehensive Planning*—In order to make effective capital planning decisions for the entire county, School and water/sewer needs should be integrated with the current CIP process.
 - *Linkage to Other Planning Processes*—Integration of all formal planning processes must occur to adequately plan for capital needs of the community, not only for the 5 year planning horizon of the CIP, but many years beyond.
- **Land Banking.** Land banking can be a responsible, cost-effective way to ensure that public agencies acquire future sites under the most desirable terms, without operating under a burden of tight time frames. Given the scarcity of available undeveloped land, the County should identify opportunities to purchase land where future public facilities can be located.
- **Capital Maintenance.** Continue to increase the funding of capital maintenance to a level that will not only protect the County’s current capital investments, but will also reduce future capital requests (as deferred maintenance grows into capital needs).
- **Capital Financing.** Given the extent of capital needs a significant, recurring funding stream is essential.
 - *Dedicated Funding*—At a minimum, current funding levels must be maintained. Increased funding is necessary to realistically meet current and future capital requirements.
 - *Financing Options*—Consideration of all financing options is important. Pay-as-You-Go financing is fiscally conservative, but also has disadvantages. Grants, impact fees, GO bonds, and other sources are all viable financing options.

Committee Ranking by Category

The ranking of individual projects was determined by over-all average score, where the highest score was the top ranked project and the lowest score was the bottom ranked project. Knowing the scoring criteria gives greater weight to community “needs” (i.e. public safety) when compared to community “wants” (i.e. library or parks and recreation), the Committee’s opinion was that a healthy community provides its citizens with a good mix of both wants and needs. Page 6 of the report presents ranked projects in 4 categories: Public Safety, Technology, Quality of Life, and Service Infrastructure.

Individual Committee Member Comments

Information presented in the Capital Project Prioritization report represents the general consensus of the members of the CIP Review Committee. While consensus information related to the Committee’s task is presented, Committee members’ individual comments about specific projects and capital planning in general are included in the Appendix.

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Capital Project Prioritization

During development of last year's CIP (FY2006-2010) the Board of Supervisors adopted a listing of "approved" projects that were scheduled over the 5 year planning period and tentative funding was identified for each project. This year's Committee (FY2006-2007) reviewed these projects as part of their evaluation process and recommends these approved projects remain at the highest priority for implementation over the next 5 year planning period. These approved projects are reported as Previously Approved Projects.

The Committee prioritized all other capital project requests by applying a set of evaluation criteria to each individual project. After scoring was completed by committee members, each project's average score was calculated and listed in numerical order with the highest score representing the greatest priority. The Level 1 projects represent capital needs that have the highest perceived community value, but have no identified funding associated with them. Succeeding levels were determined by grouping projects together that had successively lower scores.

The Committee's recommendations on capital priorities are as follows:

Department – Project	Average Total Score	Total Capital Cost
Previously Approved Projects:		
Sheriff: Regional Jail Project		\$20,000,000
General Services: New County Garage		\$2,080,000
Public Safety: 800 MHz Radio System Upgrade		\$14,000,000
Community Development: VDOT Revenue Sharing		\$5,000,000
Library: South County Library		\$12,840,000
Parks & Recreation: Garst Mill Park Improvements		\$383,000
Information Technology: Replacement of HP/3000		\$1,000,000
Economic Development : Center for Research Technology		\$7,750,000
Information Technology: Enterprise Network Security		\$175,000
Information Technology: Computer Network Infrastructure Upgrade		\$2,079,500
Information Technology: Server Replacement		\$772,500
Level 1 Projects:		
Sheriff: Roanoke County/Salem Jail Renovations	75.9	\$2,160,860
Library: Mt. Pleasant Library Relocation	75.1	\$813,250
Library: Glenvar Library Expansion	74.2	\$2,455,200
Parks & Recreation: Brambleton Center Renovations	72.3	\$330,000
Community Development: Regional Storm Water Mgt & Flood Control	72.2	\$7,500,000
Parks & Recreation: Parks & Recreation Land Bank	70.9	\$1,225,000

Level 2 Projects:

Police: South County Police Precinct	69.6	\$300,000
Parks & Recreation: Burton Softball Complex	69.5	\$344,000
Library: Vinton Library Renovation	69.3	\$895,000
Fire & Rescue: Station Renovations	68.5	\$476,850
Parks & Recreation: Walrond Park Phase III	68.5	\$339,000
Parks & Recreation: Camp Roanoke	68.2	\$203,500
Fire & Rescue: Masons Cove Bunkroom Addition	67.6	\$200,000
Parks & Recreation: Green Hill Park Phase III	66.9	\$806,000

Level 3 Projects:

Parks & Recreation: Hollins Park	66.7	\$312,000
General Services: Renovations to Service Center	66.1	\$1,200,000
Information Technology: Enterprise Storage & Backup	65.9	\$350,000
Parks & Recreation: Starkey Park	65.9	\$1,040,000
Fire & Rescue: Back Creek Station Addition	65.3	\$296,500
Fire & Rescue: New Plantation-Hollins Road Station	65.2	\$1,870,000
Greenway Development: Roanoke River Greenway - Eastern Section	64.6	\$1,776,800
Parks & Recreation: Vinyard Park Phase III	64.6	\$689,500
Parks & Recreation: Goode Park	64.1	\$215,000
Parks & Recreation: Whispering Pines	64.1	\$514,500
Fire & Rescue: New Hanging Rock Station	63.9	\$2,310,000
Parks & Recreation: Brookside Park	63.9	\$164,000
Police: Bomb Disposal Unit	63.8	\$135,000
Police: In Service Training Facility	63.1	\$5,000,000
Parks & Recreation: Stonebridge Park	63.0	\$210,000
Greenway Development: Tinker Creek Greenway	62.0	\$1,911,000
Greenway Development: Mudlick Creek Greenway	61.8	\$726,400
Information Technology: Voice Over IP	61.1	\$525,000
Fire & Rescue: New Oak Grove Station	60.8	\$2,100,000
General Services: Recycling Trailers	59.9	\$100,000
Parks & Recreation: Northside High Tennis Court Restoration	59.1	\$200,000
Library: Bent Mountain Library Expansion	57.2	\$137,000
Parks & Recreation: Family Water Park	55.8	TBD
Fire & Rescue: Station Fuel Control System	54.2	\$126,000
Parks & Recreation: Spring Hollow Park	52.1	\$2,005,000

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Project Score Summary - By Category

Department: Project	Average Total Score	Total Capital Cost
<u>Public Safety</u>		
Police: South County Police Precinct	69.6	\$300,000
Fire & Rescue: Masons Cove Bunkroom Addition	67.6	\$200,000
Fire & Rescue: Back Creek Station Addition	65.3	\$296,500
Fire & Rescue: New Plantation-Hollins Road Station	65.2	\$1,870,000
Fire & Rescue: New Hanging Rock Station	63.9	\$2,310,000
Police: Bomb Disposal Unit	63.8	\$135,000
Police: In Service Training Facility	63.1	\$5,000,000
Fire & Rescue: New Oak Grove Station	60.8	\$2,100,000
<u>Technology</u>		
Information Technology: Enterprise Storage & Backup	65.9	\$350,000
Information Technology: Voice Over IP	61.1	\$525,000
Fire & Rescue: Station Fuel Control System	54.2	\$126,000
<u>Quality of Life</u>		
Library: Mt. Pleasant Library Relocation	75.1	\$813,250
Library: Glenvar Library Expansion	74.2	\$2,455,200
Parks & Recreation: Brambleton Center Renovations	72.3	\$330,000
Parks & Recreation: Burton Softball Complex	69.5	\$344,000
Library: Vinton Library Renovation	69.3	\$895,000
Parks & Recreation: Walrond Park Phase III	68.5	\$339,000
Parks & Recreation: Camp Roanoke	68.2	\$203,500
Parks & Recreation: Green Hill Park Phase III	66.9	\$806,000
Parks & Recreation: Hollins Park	66.7	\$312,000
Parks & Recreation: Starkey Park	65.9	\$1,040,000
Greenway Development: Roanoke River Greenway - Eastern Section	64.6	\$1,776,800
Parks & Recreation: Vinyard Park Phase III	64.6	\$689,500
Parks & Recreation: Whispering Pines	64.1	\$514,500
Parks & Recreation: Goode Park	64.1	\$215,000
Parks & Recreation: Brookside Park	63.9	\$164,000
Parks & Recreation: Stonebridge Park	63.0	\$210,000
Greenway Development: Tinker Creek Greenway	62.0	\$1,911,000
Greenway Development: Mudlick Creek Greenway	61.8	\$726,400
General Services: Recycling Trailers	59.9	\$100,000

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Project Score Summary - By Category

Department: Project	Average Total Score	Total Capital Cost
Parks & Recreation: Northside High Tennis Court Restoration	59.1	\$200,000
Library: Bent Mountain Library Expansion	57.2	\$137,000
Parks & Recreation: Family Water Park	55.8	TBD
Parks & Recreation: Spring Hollow Park	52.1	\$2,005,000
<u>Service Infrastructure</u>		
Sheriff: Roanoke County/Salem Jail Renovations	75.9	\$2,160,860
Community Development: Regional Storm Water Management & Flood	72.2	\$7,500,000
Parks & Recreation: Parks & Recreation Land Bank	70.9	\$1,225,000
Fire & Rescue: Station Renovations	68.5	\$476,850
General Services: Renovations to Service Center	66.1	\$1,200,000

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Recommendations

Long-term capital planning and the need to fund critical capital assets is one of the most important functions undertaken by local government. All levels of government – federal, state, and local – struggle to replace aging capital assets, meet new needs, and make decisions whether existing assets are still required. Ongoing delivery of services can be assured only if adequate consideration is given to capital needs. In order to implement an effective capital plan, the CIP Review Committee recommends several options that should be considered by the Board of Supervisors and staff.

While the following recommendations are recurring themes from CIP Review Committees in prior years, they continue to be the focus of discussion among current committee members and are important to ensure Roanoke County's capital needs are met.

Long Range Capital Planning

Comprehensive Planning

It is important to note that current capital planning efforts of Roanoke County do not include 2 important components – Roanoke County Schools and the Western Virginia Water Authority. The Committee understands the legal separation of functions from the Board of Supervisors, but these entities represent a significant factor when considering the over-all infrastructure needs of Roanoke County and its residents. It is difficult to consider capital needs in a comprehensive manner when the methods for identifying and prioritizing projects for each entity is prepared independent of one another. A more comprehensive approach would be more efficient and effective.

Linkage to Other Planning Processes

The CIP is an important component of a locality's overall planning process and should be developed in conjunction with the comprehensive plan, annual budget process, strategic plan and other long-range planning initiatives. For the most part, CIP submissions address capital needs as they exist today – future needs for facilities, expansions, and upgrades play a lesser role in the document. To adequately plan for future capital requirements, the CIP process should be more closely associated with long-range planning initiatives that project population trends, residential growth, and commercial development along with the types and levels of services that are anticipated.

Land Banking

Land banking can be a responsible, cost-effective way to ensure that public agencies acquire future sites under the most desirable terms, without operating under a burden of tight time frames. Given the scarcity of available undeveloped land, the County should identify opportunities to purchase land where future public facilities can be located. Population shifts and demographic changes will cause alterations in the level and types of services our citizens will demand in the future and the County must be in a position to deliver these services.

Capital Maintenance

Consistent with prior CIP Review Committees, capital maintenance continues to be a concern. With increasing demand for services, increasing costs, and relatively flat operating budgets maintenance is often deferred; however, putting off maintenance has a long-term cost impact and also impacts service to the residents. A number of projects presented to the Committee, most notably Parks & Recreation, Libraries, and Fire & Rescue, had the character of on-going repair and maintenance requests that evolved into capital requests.

While it is important to increase the level of funding for capital maintenance in order to protect investments already made, it is equally important to identify and fully fund the maintenance requirements for new capital projects currently in the planning stages.

Capital Project Financing

Dedicated Funding

The Committee acknowledges the positive steps taken by the Board of Supervisors over the last several years in developing funding alternatives for the County's capital requirements, which include a joint funding agreement between the County and Schools and dedication of General Fund operating revenues for specific County projects. Given the extensive listing of capital needs it is important to not only maintain current funding levels, but to increase dedicated funding for capital projects in order to not fall further behind.

Other Financing Options

All financing options should be considered and assessed. Based on recent history and current plans, the County's primary financing option for capital is cash (Pay-as-You-Go). While this method has many advantages, care should be taken to ensure adequate reserves (cash balances) are maintained as a cushion against unexpected revenue shortfalls, emergencies, or other purposes. Grants, impact fees, tax increment financing bonds, public private partnerships, and general obligation bonds also offer advantages for certain projects.

Appendix

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Goal & Objectives

Committee Goal

The CIP Review Committee is a collaborative group established to evaluate and prioritize identified capital projects from a community perspective based upon countywide priorities articulated by the Board of Supervisors.

Committee Objectives

1. To be acquainted with the history of the County of Roanoke's Capital Improvement Program and the proposed process for the development of the CIP.
2. To become familiar with countywide capital needs identified by department heads through the review of proposals, participation in site visits, and interviews as needed.
3. To evaluate submitted capital projects based on criteria that support the County's mission and guiding principals.
4. To make recommendations on capital planning for the Board of Supervisor's consideration by February 2006.

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Project Evaluation Criteria

Providing effective and efficient services and improving the quality of life of its citizens is the County of Roanoke's mission and the foundation of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The Capital Improvement Review Committee has identified the following *Guiding Principles* for evaluating and prioritizing capital project requests in making recommendations to the Roanoke County Board of Supervisors. These principles are based on the stated priorities and approved plans of the Board of Supervisors. These principles are presented in no particular order of importance, as individual perspective will influence the relative value of each principle when compared to one another. *The Guiding Principles are as follows:*

- Provide effective and efficient governmental services to the citizens.
- Enhance public health, safety, and/or welfare issue(s).
- Promote the safety and security of our citizens while at home, at work, and at play.
- Consider solutions that extend beyond the County's boundaries in meeting future challenges.
- Use public investment as a catalyst for economic growth in a manner consistent with the Community Plan.
- Safeguard the environment and natural beauty for present and future generations.
- Maintain and sustain effective land use planning.
- Maintain or enhance cultural, recreational, educational, and social opportunities for all citizens.
- Protect existing investment in facilities and infrastructure that are vital in delivering fundamental services to our citizens.
- Anticipate future facility and infrastructure needs to best leverage capital resources of the community.
- Comply with applicable state and federal mandates.

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Evaluation Scoring Factors

Committee members scored each capital project using a point range of 1-10 for each of the following factors:

Improve Public Safety or Public Health:

Does the project address public safety, life protection, health, and welfare issues that benefit our citizens? Does the project mitigate an existing or potential liability issue?

Improve Public Quality of Life:

Does the project directly address a major demand or meet a community obligation for cultural, social, educational or leisure services?

Legal Requirements:

Is the project required by law, regulation or mandate from local, state, or federal government?

Economic Development Impact:

Does the project directly or indirectly increase net community wealth/resources?

Increases Tax or Fee Revenue:

Does the project directly increase County's recurring revenues?

Enhances Existing Services:

Does the project maintain or enhance existing service levels that are at risk without the project?

Benefit/Cost Factor:

Does project implementation produce a community benefit that exceeds investment of resources or will the project generate resources/investments from outside sources (grants, donations, etc.)?

Address Obsolescence:

Does the project address requirements for asset replacement, due to age and wear, that supports essential services or addresses the need for a new or changing service demand?

Investment to Reduce Future Costs:

Will investment in the project reduce/contain increased expenditures at a future date?

Extent of Service Area:

Does the project benefit a large population (i.e. a project that benefits a larger population/area will have greater value than a project that benefits a smaller population/area)?

Project Supports Existing County Plans or Policies:

Is the project directly referenced in existing county plans or policies as a priority?

Urgency of Need:

Does the project meet an urgent need?

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Committee Member Comments by Project

Sheriff: Roanoke County/Salem Jail Renovations

Average Total Score: 75.9, Level 1

- Appears to be overdue.
- Part of this request could be warranted for a Homeland Security Grant.
- Renovating the jail shows compassion for Sheriff's employees and the inmates who are incarcerated there.
- Updates on this facility will produce better security. Will avoid lawsuits that may be filed by inmates regarding health and safety of the jail.
- An urgent need.

Library: Mt. Pleasant Library Relocation

Average Total Score: 75.1, Level 1

- Only large section of the County without a freestanding library.
- The make ship Library needs a permanent home for the benefit of the community.
- The Mt. Pleasant area of Roanoke County is steadily growing. A library separate from Mt. Pleasant Elementary benefits the citizens through greater volume and greater access, and the school gets back access to its classroom. This investment at this time tells the citizens of Mt. Pleasant that they are valued members of the Roanoke County community.
- This facility has been passed by for renovations far too long in a growing community. Try to arrange a joint venture with Franklin County.
- The Mt. Pleasant Library's low circulation and attendance is directly related to the minimal hours (12) that it is open in one week. A new facility would provide better hours, and location which would have a direct effect on the usage.

Library: Glenvar Library Expansion

Average Total Score: 74.2, Level 1

- Building is long overdue for expansion or updating. Granting or bond referendum for Library upgrades should be considered. Possible State or Federal grants need to be investigated.
- This facility has long been ignored and should be renovated to meet state standards and made A.D.A. compliant.
- The removal of 1,000 items annually is an abundant amount of resources lost just because of a space limitation. These numbers reflect the increased need for an expansion.

Parks & Recreation: Brambleton Center Renovations

Average Total Score: 72.3, Level 1

- This is a highly valued and regarded county facility serving a large segment of the population. It should be preserved and maintained at a high level at all times.

Community Development: Regional Storm Water Management & Flood Control

Average Total Score: 72.2, Level 1

- Monies spent are matched with double returns.
- The program generates approximately \$3,000,000 for every \$1,000,000 invested. It addresses short and long term flood issues in the Roanoke Valley. By identifying the flood plains and moving homes and businesses out, the county reduces the loss caused by flooding. It's a great project!
- This is a very necessary project that will reduce the cost of flooding, as unusual amounts of storm water occur.

Parks & Recreation: Parks & Recreation Land Bank

Average Total Score: 70.9, Level 1

- Identifying & securing land for future park development and possible proffers for housing and industrial developments is a way of providing for the future. This is also an Economic Development tool.
- I applaud the Parks and Rec Department for planning now for the inevitable expansion of services needed in the near to distant future. By investing in viable property now, the county invests wisely in its own future.

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Committee Member Comments by Project

Land purchased now is an asset to be used by the county in the future or sold to fund a site that becomes more attractive in the future. Sounds like a win-win for everyone.

- Land bank needs must be addressed as the communities grow.
- The need for land banking is becoming more and more noticeable as the desire to construct new buildings is limited by the space/area that we have to work with. Banking land would be an all around benefit.
- Land keeps disappearing and Parks won't be possible in the future without land banking.

Police: South County Police Precinct

Average Total Score: 69.6, Level 2

- Surplus or future relocated service site could be used for this site. Possible sharing of location with another Agency.
- I support the "community policing" concept. The more visible the officer, the lower the crime rate. I think it would significantly enhance the department's image and effectiveness to have an appropriately professional precinct in South County.
- This will locate the proper personnel nearer the area of the greatest need, and lower response (driving) time. A potential site would be the current South County Library building when the new library is built.
- Not an expensive project and would have a high benefit.

Parks & Recreation: Burton Softball Complex

Average Total Score: 69.5, Level 2

- The revenue generated by tournament softball make this project quite a bargain.
- This is a good asset for Roanoke County, it will attract both local and out of town guests.

Library: Vinton Library Renovation

Average Total Score: 69.3, Level 2

- The renovation will overcome many problems and make this facility more user friendly and A.D.A. compliant.
- The condition of the Vinton Library's parking facility is inadequate for the site and requires repair.

Fire & Rescue: Station Renovations

Average Total Score: 68.5, Level 2

- This should be covered under maintenance budget.
- I see this as a maintenance project, not a capital improvement project.
- Due to stress this personnel should have very comfortable living accommodations.
- Urgent need, but again it's not CIP, it's maintenance that hasn't been kept up with over the years.

Parks & Recreation: Walrond Park Phase III

Average Total Score: 68.5, Level 2

- This project will update this facility and complete the project as planned.

Parks & Recreation: Camp Roanoke

Average Total Score: 68.2, Level 2

- Regional program that draws people from many states and Canada.
- This work will conclude this facility renovation. This camp is a one of a kind asset in Roanoke County.

Fire & Rescue: Masons Cove Bunkroom Addition

Average Total Score: 67.6, Level 2

- Current living conditions are not acceptable!
- This bunk room is crowded and uncomfortable, and should provide better accommodations for our safety personnel.
- This project doesn't affect very many citizens but we shouldn't ask volunteers and county staff to sleep in such cramped quarters.

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Committee Member Comments by Project

Parks & Recreation: Green Hill Park Phase III

Average Total Score: 66.9, Level 2

- This is an investment that will pay for itself.
- As we learn from our Salem neighbors, development of top notch recreational facilities can pay great dividends. It makes perfect sense to gradually improve Green Hill Park.
- This is a superior park in the system, a must see area for our visitors and should enjoy continued development.
- Lights and restrooms would benefit the use of Green Hill for such things as tournaments.

Parks & Recreation: Hollins Park

Average Total Score: 66.7, Level 3

- This is probably a stop-gap solution for a current problem, this type of updating for this facility should be continued.

General Services: Renovations to Service Center

Average Total Score: 66.1, Level 3

- The facility is decidedly inadequate, though I am not convinced renovation is cost efficient in the long run. Perhaps razing the existing building and moving it up the hill away from the flood plain makes more sense.
- These improvements would make use of a good facility that would be obsolete without the renovations.
- Something needs to be done in order for this building to have a functional fire alarm.

Information Technology: Enterprise Storage & Backup

Average Total Score: 65.9, Level 3

- Possible Lease due to shortness of life.
- Catastrophic loss of data is an often overlooked but very real risk in our technology driven world.
- All of the record storage should have one consolidated location to be efficient.
- This is not really CIP, it's more of a capital maintenance project to me.

Parks & Recreation: Starkey Park

Average Total Score: 65.9, Level 3

- This is a heavily used facility, the expenditure should complete this project as envisioned.

Fire & Rescue: Back Creek Station Addition

Average Total Score: 65.3, Level 3

- The growth in this area is tremendous, the need for shorter response is paramount.
- I don't think this is really an urgent need. Back Creek has the least calls of all stations in the county.

Fire & Rescue: New Plantation-Hollins Road Station

Average Total Score: 65.2, Level 3

- Need study as to need of full time personal to run this station.
- Explore this as a joint venture with the City of Roanoke, to provide better safety to the area.
- While I do feel we need another department in this part of the county, I feel this location would not be the best. I feel if this department is put near the intersection of Plantation Rd. and Hershberger Rd. we would be running back-up calls for the city (Williamson Rd.) area as much as our own county calls. Also I do know that First Team is interested in purchasing station 5 property. I think this whole project needs to be looked at with a better plan and have some idea where the funding is coming from. SUGGESTION: Give First Team Auto Mall a price to purchase station 5 that could help fund a new Station 5 in a central location somewhere between the proposed location and the existing location, maybe the intersection of Williamson Rd. and Plantation Rd. this would provide easy access to I-81, north and south on Williamson Rd. and Plantation to the city line.

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Committee Member Comments by Project

Greenway Development: Roanoke River Greenway - Eastern Section

Average Total Score: 64.6, Level 3

- While traditional public safety agencies (fire, police, etc.) have garnered needed attention in recent years, I think it is time to shift focus to less tangible quality-of-life trends. People may well be choosing communities based on the availability of adequate recreational greenspace. The Roanoke Valley is well on its way in this arena with the valley greenway system. Completion of the eastern section of the Roanoke River Greenway shows Roanoke County's commitment to the overall greenway project.
- This is an opportunity to showcase the Roanoke Valley area, and should be pursued strongly.
- By completing the greenway's plan to link the trails together, outside exercise would be promoted amongst the community. Providing local trails will encourage the area to exercise and increase their health.
- Greenways are a nice feature for the community but they need to look at placement - there's not a great need for biking/walking trails over great distances - most people just use them to exercise, not for commuting purposes.

Parks & Recreation: Vinyard Park Phase III

Average Total Score: 64.6, Level 3

- Utilized by both Vinton and East County residents. Possibility to lease more fields.
- This project is akin to the Green Hill Park, Camp Roanoke, and Burton Softball Complex proposals. They all have the ability to attract tourists and tourism dollars to Roanoke County.
- Sharing this facility is a good move for our county and should be encouraged in the future.

Parks & Recreation: Goode Park

Average Total Score: 64.1, Level 3

- This project would eliminate constant maintenance to a much used greenway and provide relief to parking problems when youth athletics, park and Greenway users overcrowd the existing facilities.
- The large volume of use will require the outlined improvements.
- With the frequent use of the ball fields & park by local teams and walkers, a paved parking lot and extension to the greenway would benefit the public.

Parks & Recreation: Whispering Pines

Average Total Score: 64.1, Level 3

- The facility needs this improvement to meet the community needs.
- There is definitely a need to have public restrooms in a public park.

Fire & Rescue: New Hanging Rock Station

Average Total Score: 63.9, Level 3

- This station should plug a gap in our safety net. I would urge joint talks with Salem and a possible joint staffing arrangement.
- This should be a joint project with Salem if we are going to do it. Doesn't really serve that many citizens since there's such a narrow sliver of county in that area.

Parks & Recreation: Brookside Park

Average Total Score: 63.9, Level 3

- Needed repairs and use of newly obtained land.
- This will bring this facility up to date, and bring it into A.D.A. compliance.

Police: Bomb Disposal Unit

Average Total Score: 63.8, Level 3

- Seems like this could be paid for with Homeland Security Grants.
- This should be a regional joint project. It should also qualify for Homeland Security Funds. Roanoke County should have one person to oversee the request, advise on requesting grants and finding all possible sources of funding that could be available to different departments. You have to ask to be turned down.
- I am skeptical about the need for a bomb disposal unit. However, it appears that both Roanoke County and

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Committee Member Comments by Project

Roanoke City will partner on this project, and I support any such collaboration.

- This is an overall necessity in the community in order to provide a safe environment for our citizens. This equipment can not be borrowed on a dependable basis.
- With the number of bomb threats tossed around through local schools, whether they be a hoax or authentic, knowing that the professional could be anywhere in 13 counties is not overly assuring. By funding a bomb disposal unit, the students and government buildings would feel much more reassured of their safety.
- Should be a joint project with other localities to reduce upfront costs.

Police: In Service Training Facility

Average Total Score: 63.1, Level 3

- Proposed site might be used for other use. Review surplus or to be vacated sites for this project.
- The demands on public safety employees have never been greater. The most sure way to consistent, high-quality performance is frequent, high-quality training. Well trained public safety officers more efficiently preserve human and property resources in the count. Moreover, excellent training facilities show agency commitment to safety, and this ultimately attracts and retains high caliber employees.
- Will enable our officers to be current physically and mentally to maintain a high level of efficiency.
- The need for a 40,000 s.f. building is not there. Something smaller would probably be more appropriate.

Parks & Recreation: Stonebridge Park

Average Total Score: 63.0, Level 3

- This project will renovate this facility and bring it to current standards.

Greenway Development: Tinker Creek Greenway

Average Total Score: 62.0, Level 3

- This will be a very pleasant trail with very strong historical significance and should be completed.
- Greenways are a nice feature for the community but they need to look at placement - there's not a great need for biking/walking trails over great distances - most people just use them to exercise, not for commuting purposes.

Greenway Development: Mudlick Creek Greenway

Average Total Score: 61.8, Level 3

- This project will provide many recreational opportunities as well as assist in controlling area flood water.
- Greenways are a nice feature for the community but they need to look at placement - there's not a great need for biking/walking trails over great distances - most people just use them to exercise, not for commuting purposes.

Information Technology: Voice Over IP

Average Total Score: 61.1, Level 3

- Conclusion of this project will provide better communications within county facilities, and reduce cost. It will also enhance the safety and security of our system.

Fire & Rescue: New Oak Grove Station

Average Total Score: 60.8, Level 3

- Good idea to plan for the future. Purchasing land now helps reduce costs in the future.
- With the several schools and retirement facilities nearby, better fire and rescue service response times are a must. Could this also be a possible joint station with the City of Roanoke?
- The Cave Spring station is less than 2 miles from Oak Grove and is a straight shot down 419. I don't think a new station in Oak Grove is needed due to its proximity to Cave Spring. Response times would not be significantly shortened by this project.

General Services: Recycling Trailers

Average Total Score: 59.9, Level 3

- Should be part of Equipment Purchase or Lease to own.

Roanoke County CIP Review Committee

Committee Member Comments by Project

- Reducing the burden on the existing landfill is reason enough to spend \$100,000 for this project. Citizens have requested it, and to be frank, recycling in today's world has become an important social conscience/quality of life issue.
- This will enable an orderly handling of recycled materials that may be sold for a profit.
- Recycling has multiple benefits (saves space in landfills, recycling revenue, a better environment) the benefits from this project will continue to grow.
- This is a good idea, but I would imagine there are more pressing needs this money could be put towards.

Parks & Recreation: Northside High Tennis Court Restoration

Average Total Score: 59.1, Level 3

- Should be in School Board budget or shared.
- This is a good upgrade that will keep the facility in good condition for perhaps 10 years.

Library: Bent Mountain Library Expansion

Average Total Score: 57.2, Level 3

- This is an asset in a growth area, and should be kept up to date as the community develops.

Parks & Recreation: Family Water Park

Average Total Score: 55.8, Level 3

- Could be wide draw and enhance The Explorer Park Program in the future.
- I think this idea has merit, but without projected costs, it is impossible to fully consider the project.

Fire & Rescue: Station Fuel Control System

Average Total Score: 54.2, Level 3

- This could be a Homeland Security Request to maintain security over potential fuel sources that are at risk.
- I see this as more of a maintenance/equipment upgrade issue, not a capital project.
- More accurate recording will improve overall maintenance of the equipment.
- Not a need. There is currently little or no abuse of station fuel and the manual system seems to be working fine.

Parks & Recreation: Spring Hollow Park

Average Total Score: 52.1, Level 3

- Not sure this project would really benefit that many Roanoke Co. citizens due to its location in far west county. - too far for someone in North or South county to drive just to walk or bike.